



Washington State Department of
Early Learning

Early Start Act, Section 18 Annual Progress Report

**ELAC, Early Achievers Review Subcommittee
September 25, 2015**

Early Start Act, Section 18

Beginning December 15, 2015, and each December 15th thereafter, DEL, in collaboration with the statewide CCA, and the ELAC Early Achievers Review Subcommittee, shall submit a progress report to the governor and the legislature regarding providers' progress in the Early Achievers program.

Early Start Act, Section 18

Annual Report Data Components:

- 1.a-j child care data requirements
- 1.k-l ECEAP data requirements
- 2 description of the EA extension protocol
- 3 specifics for data collection and analysis
- 4.a-b analysis of the reasons of unsuccessful ratings per geographic regions (starting 2018)

Annual Report Recommendations

1. Use racial equity lens - look at data from a racial equity perspective
2. Consider political and programmatic “powers” of the report
3. Use the report format to tell our quantitative and qualitative story, the story/development of the system
4. Use report as an opportunity to describe a desirable future of EL services in our state, define a trajectory after the RTT
5. Create cohesive framing and language
6. Present a complex and collaborative work of all state EL partners
7. Embed national data, best-practices, and local small samples data to the examinations and analysis of the required data sets
8. Use variety of data to support presentation of the required recommendations

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1 (a)(i)	The number, and relative percentage, of family child care and center providers who have enrolled in the Early Achievers and who have completed the level 2 activities.	<p>Will use current EA data by county and/or zip code</p> <p>Include enrollment data to measure whether we're meeting targets</p>	<p>Describe current data collection approach and methodology. Provide brief data summary.</p>
1 (a)(ii)	The number, and relative percentage, of family child care and center providers who have enrolled in the Early Achievers and who have completed rating readiness consultation and are waiting to be rated.		
1 (a)(iii)	The number, and relative percentage, of family child care and center providers who have enrolled in the Early Achievers and who have achieved the required rating level to remain eligible for state-funded support under the early childhood education and assistance program or a subsidy under the working connections child care program.		
1 (a)(iv)	The number, and relative percentage, of family child care and center providers who have enrolled in the Early Achievers and who have not achieved the required rating level initially but qualified for and are working through intensive targeted support in preparation for a partial rerate outside the standard rating cycle.		

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1 (a)(v)	The number, and relative percentage, of family child care and center providers who have enrolled in the Early Achievers and who have not achieved the required rating level initially and engaged in remedial activities before successfully achieving the required rating level.	Not collecting required data yet.	Describe current practice supporting providers to transition from level 2 to level 3, including “remedial” steps. Consider to provide current data (CCA). Describe policy plans and implementation timeline for remedial activities.
1 (a)(vi)	The number, and relative percentage, of family child care and center providers who have enrolled in the Early Achievers and who have not achieved the required rating after completing remedial activities.	Don’t currently collect data on why people pick their slot or don’t meet their window, but can ask the field. Requests for extension are held in e-mail (CCA), and they provide reason for extension (difficult to extract the info)	describe services to providers rated at level 2, although they are not yet the official “remedial activities.
1 (a)(vii)	The number, and relative percentage, of family child care and center providers who have enrolled in the Early Achievers and who have received an extension from the department based on exceptional circumstances pursuant to RCW 43.215.100.		Describe current practice (CCA). Provide an overview of the data collection methodology that will be used.

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1(b)	A review of the services available to providers and children from diverse cultural backgrounds.	<p>Pull data points we can for FY2015 for children served through: ECEAP, ESIT, Subsidy (WCCC and SCC), Homeless Child Care, Home Visiting, ECLIPSE, HS PIR, EL Workforce Report, annual child care referral reports (CCA), qualitative data from UW, CCA, SEIU teams on work that contributed to meeting the needs of culturally diverse children and providers. Ask WithinReach for referral data points. Explore licensing data.</p> <p>Look at the number of providers waitlisted or who applied for scholarships and didn't receive them, so we know how much more funding is necessary to meet needs.</p>	<p>Determine definition for "diverse cultural backgrounds". Describe gaps in data collection from current systems. Provide an action plan for future data collection and reporting.</p> <p>"diverse cultural backgrounds" definition will have an impact on who qualifies for the needs based grants.</p> <p>Intent is to figure out whether we're meeting cultural needs of children and providers. Describe where we are and what able to do with existing resources, and what more we can do with additional resources</p>

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1(c)	An examination of the effectiveness of efforts to increase successful participation by providers serving children and families from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and providers who serve children from low-income households.	Collect CCA's qualitative data (Regional Coordinators). Use ECEAP data points provided for 1(b). Use economic risk and subsidy provider data points from monthly EA dashboard reports. looked at enrollment by language - have info on providers enrolled in EA (CCA) pull data from work force report, but providing the info is optional. Can move to a requirement for next report	Determine definition for "diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds". Identify and describe improvements to data collection and reporting, re: correlation of provider demographics with children demographics, look at cultural backgrounds and racial/ethnic subgroups data. This data will correspond with the development of the eliminating barriers for participation in EA protocol – provided needed justification.
1(d)(i)	A description of the primary obstacles and challenges faced by providers who have not achieved the required rating level to remain eligible to receive a subsidy under the working connections child care program.	Use qualitative data from CCA and DEL EA. Use ratings data – breakdown of ratings results for providers who change subsidy acceptance status. May help us uncover specific issues. Ask SEIU to help gather qualitative data. 2 types of info: obstacles for joining and obstacles for getting the rating	Determine data collection method for future feedback from providers on primary obstacles and challenges. Consider using PRISM data to look for rating trends. Use analysis of the 30 months 2% subsidy incentive data. Refer to the national data, re: linguistic and cultural accommodations and flexible processes that meet providers where they are.

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1(d)(ii)	A description of the primary obstacles and challenges faced by providers who have not achieved the required rating level to remain eligible to receive state-funded support under the ECEAP.	Use qualitative data from CCA and DEL EA staff. CCA has some data on blended sites, but wants to be careful using it to over generalize.	Determine data collection method for future feedback from providers on primary obstacles and challenges. Consider to use PRISM data to look for rating trends. Describe ECEAP providers' obstacles being on a different pathway. Justify blended sites issues. Analyze timelines, resources and supports. Consider specific challenges for sites in school districts.
1 (e)	A summary of the types of exceptional circumstances for which the department has granted an extension pursuant to RCW 43.215.100.	Not applicable this year.	Describe development of policy and tracking mechanisms (in MERIT) for exceptional circumstances. Refer to the annual report component 2.
1(f)	The average amount of time required for providers to achieve local level milestones within each level of the early achievers program.	Use data points from the monthly EA dashboard reports. Consider to quantify QIP and goals (CCA). Explore UW evaluation data.	Determine definition for "local level milestones". Provide description of currently available data, re: looking at the amount of time it takes for providers to reach EA rating levels. Illustrate how to support different regions based on what they need - differentiation.

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1(g)	To the extent data is available, an analysis of the distribution of early achievers program-rated facilities in relation to child and provider demographics, including but not limited to race and ethnicity, home language, and geographical location.	No analysis for this year's report can include a map overlaying the data, but it won't be robust.	Describe a future use of MERIT data to analyze provider data by location, EA rating level, and staff demographics (race, ethnicity, language) to child level demographics from ELMS (ECEAP) and WCCC/SCC Subsidy. Consider to look at distribution of facilities and match with census demographic data at the county or zip code level.
1(h)	Recommendations for improving access for children from diverse cultural backgrounds to providers rated at a level 3 or higher in the early achievers program.	Explore CCA data.	Describe how to expand access to information, reduction of barriers protocol to increase to the quality of services they're already accessing – communication of EA data.
1(i)	Recommendations for improving the early achievers program standards.	Explore CCA and UW EA evaluation data. Use an example of the current adjustments of the level 3 ERS requirements.	Provide description of the standards alignment project, include how standards value cultural and linguistic diversity. EA 2.0

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1(k)	The number of contracted slots that use both ECEAP funding and WCCC funding.	ECEAP data points for 2014-15 school year 2015-16 there will be no slots using both ECEAP and WCCC.	Consider to use national data for framing highlight that CCDF plan encourages blending funding to provide contracted slots
1(l)(i)	A description of the ECEAP implementation to include the progress on early childhood education and assistance program implementation as required pursuant to RCW 43.215.415, 43.215.425,21 and 43.215.455;	During the last three years, ECEAP has expanded by 2,300 slots. Pull some data points out of caseload forecast.	Justify the process of updating the ECEAP implementation plan, to reflect the vision (including Full School Day and Extended Day slots). Describe the work with the Caseload Forecast Council to streamline the ECEAP Caseload Forecast to serve all eligible children by Fall 2020.
1(l)(ii)	A description of the ECEAP implementation to include an examination of the regional distribution of new preschool programming by zip code.	ECEAP slots distribution data by county and zip code.	Describe available data and methodology. Provide data summary and brief analysis. Include facilities assessment
1(l)(iii)	A description of the ECEAP implementation to include an analysis of the impact of preschool expansion on low-income neighborhoods and communities.	Slots and facilities data and distribution by county showing the growth in low-income neighborhoods and communities.	Describe available data and methodology, including saturation study. Provide P-3 alignment perspective referring to K transition and WaKIDS data.

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1(l)(iv)	A description of the ECEAP implementation to include recommendations to address any identified barriers to access to quality preschool for children living in low-income neighborhoods.	Use updated expansion plan to review access and barrier issues. Explore WSA qualitative data.	Describe available data and methodology. Justify expansion plan by providing regional/zip code data of % of children eligible for ECEAP services and % of children currently served.
1(l)(v)	A description of the ECEAP implementation to include an analysis of any impact of extended day early care and education opportunities directives.	Explore WSA and CCA qualitative data. Provide and analyze the converted and new slots data.	Describe available data and methodology. Consider to use national data and Gates research for framing. Describe surveys and feedback loops around barriers with contractors and stakeholders, re: include to the ongoing ECEAP self-assessment process and to the contractual language.
1(l)(vi)	A description of the ECEAP implementation to include an examination of any identified barriers for providers to offer extended day early care and education opportunities.	Use DEL's survey data of potential applicants who submitted a letter of intent (2015) but did not apply for ECEAP expansion.	Describe available data and methodology. Describe DEL's work with the Gates Foundation, the Governor's Office and OSPI to better understand any facilities issues related to ECEAP expansion. Consider to refer to the City of Seattle data.

Annual Report 2015

Reference from Early Start Act Section 18.	Requirement	Data for the First Annual Report (Dec 2015)	Data Justifications and Narratives
1(I)(vii)	A description of the ECEAP implementation to include an analysis of the demand for full-day programming for early childhood education and assistance program providers required under RCW 43.215.415.	DEL has recently written a decision package requesting funding for demand analysis.	Use national data for framing. Describe data collection process and methodology. Justify an ongoing need for the demand and supply data.
1(I)(viii)	A description of the ECEAP implementation to include to the extent data is available, an analysis of the cultural diversity of early childhood education and assistance program providers and participants.	use ECEAP data points from 1(b).	use MERIT provider level demographics and ELMS (ECEAP) child and family level demographics for analysis.
2	The first annual report shall include a description of the EA program extension protocol required under RCW 43.215.100.	Narrative description of plans for extension protocol. Use CCA data, re: on average, it takes about 1 year for providers to get rerated, including getting the results back.	Determine definitions for “exceptional circumstances” and “demonstrated engagement in EA”. Justify extension criteria by using current data. Consider justifying whether the extension should be longer, a one-time extension, length of time needed may depend on the reason for requesting an extension (moving facilities, illness, etc.)

